

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 3, 2007. Claims 34-63 are presented for examination, of which Claims 34, 46-49 and 54-60 are in independent form and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, in terms which distinguish over the art of record. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 49, 50, 53-60, 62 and 63 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,215,523 (Anderson et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,441,854 (Fellegara et al.). In addition, Claim 51 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Anderson '523* in view of *Fellegara* and U.S. Patent 6,657,702 (Chui et al.), Claim 52, as being obvious from *Anderson '523* in view of *Fellegara* and U.S. Patent 6,680,749 (Anderson et al.), Claims 34, 36-40, 44-48 and 61, as being obvious from *Anderson '749* in view of U.S. Patents 6,549,304 (Dow et al.) and 6,215,523 (Anderson et al.) and *Fellegara*, Claim 41, as being obvious from *Anderson '749* in view of *Dow*, *Anderson '523*, *Fellegara* and U.S. Patent 5,752,053 (Takakura et al.), and Claims 42 and 43, as being obvious from *Anderson '749* in view of *Dow*, *Anderson '523*, *Fellegara* and *Chui*.

Applicant believes that the nature of what is being claimed, and the cited prior art, have been adequately discussed in previous papers, and that it is not necessary to repeat that discussion in full. While not agreeing with the propriety of the outstanding rejections, Applicant has nonetheless amended the independent claims to clarify still further the image processing apparatus of the present invention. That apparatus, as claimed in Claim 34, effects, in a size larger than that of a captured reduction image, automatic

sequential display of images corresponding to stored images which correspond respectively to captured reduction images selected by a reduction image selection unit, and comprises a holding unit adapted to hold information indicating which of the images is designated as an image to be subjected to a specific image process, during at least the automatic and sequential display, and a specifying unit adapted to specify the storage image corresponding to the image indicated by the information held by the holding unit, as a group of the images to be subjected to the specific image process, when the automatic sequential display of the images is completed. The holding unit is supported by Fig.5 and the accompanying portions of the specification, and the amended specifying unit is supported by the description of page 15, lines 12-17.<sup>14</sup> By virtue of the above-described feature, the apparatus of Claim 34 provides the advantage that the user can judge whether the image displayed is good or not, in judging which image(s) the user will specify for being subjected to the specific image process in succession during automatically and sequentially displaying the images in a size larger than thumbnail size.

The above-described feature of is not seen to be taught or suggested by anything that has been found in any of *Anderson '749*, *Dow*, *Anderson '523* or *Fellegara*. None of those references teach a holding unit adapted to hold information indicating which of the images is designated as an image to be subjected to a specific image process, during at least automatic and sequential display, as recited in Claim 34, since none of those documents disclose or suggest a designating unit adapted to designate at least one image among images displayed in a size larger than that of a reduction image, as an image to be

---

<sup>14</sup> It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

subjected to a specific image process, as recited in that claim. In addition, none of those documents is seen to teach a specifying unit adapted to specify a storage image corresponding to an image indicated by information held by such holding unit, as an image group to be subjected to the specific image process, when the automatic sequential display is completed, as recited in Claim 34. (In this context, while the Office Action specifically cites column 6, lines 13-63, of *Dow* as teaching the recited function of specifying an image as an image group to be subjected to a specific image process, when automatic sequential display is completed, Applicant strongly disagrees that any such teaching could be found in that passage.) Therefore, Applicant considers that none of *Anderson* '749 or '523, *Dow*, or *Fellegara* disclose or suggest the specifying unit functioning together with the holding unit as recited in Claim 34.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Claim 34 is allowable over those documents, taken separately, or in the combination proposed in the Office Action, assuming for argument's sake that such combination is a proper one.

Independent Claims 46-48 are method, medium and program claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 34, and therefore are also believed to be allowable for the reasons just stated.

Independent Claim 49 recites, among other features, an image processing apparatus, which causes a display device to display a reduction images captured by a capturing unit, includes a second display control unit adapted to cause a display device to automatically change, sequentially, display of images each larger than, and each corresponding to, a respective reduction image displayed by the display device, and an indication unit adapted to indicate at least one image among the images automatically

changed and sequentially displayed, to register the plural indicated images indicated as a target of a single process. By virtue of this feature, since an image to be subjected to an image process can be specified from among plural images which are displayed automatically and sequentially in a size larger than that of the captured reduction image, the apparatus of Claim 49 provides the advantage that the user can judge whether the image displayed is good or not, so as to decide whether to specify that that image is to be subjected to the specific image process, during automatically and sequentially displaying the images in a size larger than thumbnail size.

Again, these features of Claim 49 are not believed to be taught or suggested by anything found or pointed out in *Anderson '523* or *Fellegara*. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that *Anderson '523* fails to teach an indication unit adapted to indicate at least one image among images automatically changed and sequentially displayed, recited in Claim 49. Applicant submits that this document also does not disclose or suggest automatic and sequential image display. Moreover, even if *Fellegara* is deemed to teach automatic and sequential image display, nothing in that patent would suggest to one of merely ordinary skill to perform an automatic and sequential display of the image in a size larger than that of a reduced image. *A fortiori*, nothing in this document is believed to disclose or suggest indicating at least one image among images automatically changed and sequentially displayed in a size larger than that of a reduction image displayed by a first display control unit, as recited in Claim 49, and nothing in *Anderson '523* or *Fellegara* therefore disclose or suggest the indicating unit functioning together with the second display control unit as recited in Claim 49.

For at least these reasons, Claim 49 is believed to be allowable over *Anderson '523* and *Fellegara*, taken separately or in the combination proposed in the Office Action, assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be a proper one.

Independent Claims 55-57 are method, program and medium claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 49, respectively, and therefore are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Independent Claim 54 recites that the image processing apparatus claimed therein is arranged to effect control so that captured images are automatically and sequentially displayed in full-screen as a slideshow and indicate at least one image among the images displayed in full-screen as the slideshow to register the indicated image as a target of a specific process. (This feature of the present invention is supported by the description of page 11, lines 10-14.<sup>2)</sup> By virtue of this feature, since an image to be subjected to an image process can be specified from among images which are displayed automatically and sequentially in full-screen as the slideshow, the advantage is provided that the user can judge whether the image displayed is good or not, to specify the image to be subjected to the specific image process, in succession during automatically and sequentially displaying the images in full-screen as the slideshow.

The above-described feature recited in Claim 54 is not taught or suggested by anything found in *Anderson '523* or *Fellegara*. As the Examiner states in the Office Action, *Anderson '523* fails to teach to indicate at least one image among images automatically and sequentially displayed in full-screen as a slideshow. In this connection,

---

<sup>2)</sup> It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

Applicant submits that this document also does not disclose or suggest automatic and sequential image display. Even if *Fellegara* be deemed to show automatic and sequential image display by itself, nothing found or pointed out in that patent discloses or suggests automatically and sequentially display the image in full-screen as a slideshow. This reference therefore does not disclose or suggest indicating at least one image among images automatically and sequentially displayed in full-screen as a slideshow. Therefore, neither *Anderson* '523 nor *Fellegara* discloses or suggests the indicating unit functioning together with the display control unit as recited in Claim 54.

For at least these reasons, Claim 54 is believed to be allowable over *Anderson* '523 and *Fellegara*, taken separately or in the proposed combination, assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be a proper one.

Independent Claims 58-60 are method, program and medium claims corresponding to apparatus Claim 54, and therefore are also believed to be allowable over those patents, for the same reasons.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/  
Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200